

Remarks

Claims 9-16 are pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-13 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Nichelson (4796878) in view of Foote (3627389). Claims 14-16 were rejected as being obvious over Yergensen (5655762) in view of Foote.

The remarks in support of the rejections are nearly identical to those presented in the prior Action. The Examiner has failed to address the distinguishing features noted in Applicants' response to the prior Action, which are again noted below. Rather, the Examiner continues to assert that Foote teaches the claimed bearing. This assertion, plainly, is not correct. If the Examiner continues to disagree with Applicants' analysis of Foote, she is respectfully requested to specifically point out *and explain* those passages in Foote that support her position. Absent such a showing, the claims should be allowed.

So far as is relevant to the claimed invention, Foote teaches a conventional spherical journal bearing. In a journal bearing, the stationary supporting part is called the "bearing" and that portion of a moving part directly supported by the bearing is called the "journal." The surfaces of each of these parts that move against one another are called the "bearing surface" and the "journal surface", respectively. In Foote, the bearing surface and the journal surface are both spherical. Foote, Figs. 1, 3 and 5, and column 2, lines 10-11 and 22-24. To the extent Nichelson and Yergensen can be deemed to teach any particular bearing design, both teach a cylindrical journal bearing commonly used on printer feed shafts in which the bearing surface and the journal surface are both cylindrical.

In the mechanism of Claims 9 and 14, by contrast, the bearings supporting the shaft include a cylindrical bearing surface and a spherical journal surface. Claims 9 and 14 recite "bearings mounted to the chassis and supporting the shaft, each bearing having a cylindrical inner bearing surface; and the shaft having a spherical journal surface inside and rotatable against each bearing surface." None of the cited references teach or even suggest the claimed bearing. Indeed, so far as Applicants have been able to determine, the claimed bearing distinguishes itself from the bearing art in general, and specifically for use in printer feed mechanisms as claimed. The problems associated with conventional bearings in this application

are noted in paragraph 0001 of the Specification and the advantages of the claimed bearing are noted in paragraphs 0013 and 0014. The absence of a suitable conventional bearing for this particular application, either a cylindrical journal bearing or a spherical journal bearing, gave rise to the new design.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show that the cited references teach or suggest all claim limitations. The combination of references cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest bearings that include a cylindrical bearing surface and a spherical journal surface, as recited in Claims 9 and 14. Hence, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the rejection of Claims 9 and 14 should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-13 also distinguish patentably over the cited references due to their dependence on Claim 9.

Claim 15 recites a spherical journal surface supported inside and rotatable against a cylindrical bearing surface. Claim 16 recites a cylindrical bearing supporting a spherical journal. For the same reasons noted above for Claims 9-14, therefore, Claims 15 and 16 also distinguish over the cited art.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,974
(208) 433-1991 x204